

liberal democracy, except for the obligatory references to Hobbes and Locke, he largely takes the meaning of liberal democracy—and of the related concepts of freedom and consent—as a given, making little effort to trace out the complexity of these concepts, or their evolution during the period in question. As a result, he never explores how different actors during this period infused these concepts with very different meanings that evolved over time. As Eric Foner notes in a related context, “It is now clear that if nineteenth-century Americans shared a common language of politics, the very universality of that rhetoric camouflaged a host of divergent connotations and emphases. Concepts central to the era’s political culture— independence, equality, citizenship, freedom—were subject to constant challenge and redefinition, their substance changing over time as different groups sought to redraw their boundaries and reshape their meanings” (*Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men*, 1995, p. x).

Had Block engaged more deeply with earlier American notions of freedom, he might have been more restrained in his assertion that children’s socialization was inimical to American conceptions of the free self (e.g., “[G]iven the focus on individual liberty, the young could not even be encouraged to strike a more permissive balance between deference and independence. Rather, they had to be persuaded that a life of freedom was being nurtured from the outset. Americans thus demanded of child rearing a seemingly paradoxical outcome: an individual both convinced that he was entirely self-determining and yet fully adaptive in his conduct” [p. 21]). Certainly, many liberal democrats of the period would not have subscribed to the notion that the American commitment to freedom necessarily required that individuals be “entirely self-determining,” as Block asserts is the case (p. 21); they would instead have seen individuals as necessarily socialized into a particular social order and freedom as consisting of having a limited range of autonomy in adulthood. In setting up socialization as inherently opposed to the complete freedom that citizens were supposed to have, and as conflicting with the consent that they were supposed to give, Block reads in an irreconcilable conflict that many early Americans would not have recognized.

Finally, this work would have been enriched by engagement with the ways that our best contemporary liberal thinkers have sought to reconcile the collective imperative of forming children’s liberal democratic character against liberalism’s more individualist ideals. Contrary to Block’s assertion that “[s]cholars have lent credibility to the liberal culture of freedom by minimizing the role of social engineering and treating child rearing as an apolitical process[, in which the] critical work of shaping the young [is] unsullied by the instrumental demands of programmatic agendas and designs” (p. 24), a number of fine scholars—including Stephen Macedo, William Galston, Nancy Rosenblum, Thomas Spragens, and Eamonn Callan—

have conducted a sophisticated conversation about the legitimacy of socializing young citizens for citizenship and have participated in nuanced discussions about the means and appropriate limits on such socialization. Attention to their varied positions might have led Block to see child rearing and education projects in terms of shades of gray rather than black—recognizing that some child rearing and educational methods are less coercive than others, and that many are potentially more justified under particular strands of liberal democratic thought than outright coercion. Attention to these shades of gray would have allowed him to consider how the many historical changes detailed in his book fit into this more nuanced picture of the varieties of liberal theory and its attendant practices.

Latino Representation in State Houses and Congress. By Jason P. Casellas. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 208p. \$82.00.
doi:10.1017/S1537592712003738

— Brinck Kerr, *University of Arkansas*

As the Latino share of the US population approaches 20%, scholarly questions about the representation of the nation’s largest minority group have become increasingly prominent. In this well-written research monograph that focuses primarily on descriptive representation, Jason Casellas’ central question is: “Under what conditions are Latinos elected to Congress and to state legislatures?” (p. 28). Casellas does an excellent job throughout the analysis of addressing subethnic differences among Latinos, such as the historical background, context, region, and skin color of Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans. Readers interested in the similarities and complex differences among these three groups will find fascinating the introductory material on Latino incorporation into American society. The level of sensitivity to subethnic characteristics is an intellectual achievement that should serve as an example to other researchers.

Casellas pointedly reminds us that demographics are central to the destiny of Latinos (p. 52). The initial empirical analysis investigates the extent to which institutions, politics, and ethnic factors contribute to Latino descriptive representation in all 50 states. The analysis shows that the determinants of the percentage of Latinos serving in legislative chambers are the percentage of Latinos in the state, the extent of liberalism among the citizenry, and the presence of a citizen legislature. Each of these factors contributes in a positive way to Latino descriptive representation.

The district-level analysis of the conditions under which Latinos are elected to the US House of Representatives and to seven state legislatures—New Mexico, California, Texas, Arizona, Florida, New York, and New Jersey—provides novel comparisons about descriptive representation. Latinos have a lower probability of being elected to

the House than to any of the state legislatures with the exception of New York; however, there is significant variation in the probability of election across the seven state legislatures. Casellas finds that New Mexico and Florida are the states most conducive to the election of Latino legislators. By contrast, New York and Texas are the least conducive. The analysis indicates that Latinos have the best chance of being elected in districts with Latino majorities, followed by majority-white districts, then majority-minority districts with strong Latino pluralities, and, finally, majority-black districts.

What is the situation for non-Latino majority districts, those in which Latinos do not enjoy an obvious advantage? The results show that Latinos are becoming contenders in many such districts—and that the Republican Party is much more likely to field competitive Latinos in majority-white districts. There is some evidence of the election of Latinos in districts with combined African American and Latino majorities. Casellas argues that as Latinos become more assimilated into the mainstream, the number of Latinos elected to Congress and state legislatures will continue to increase. He also thinks that redistricting will be less of a necessity for the election of more Latino candidates than it will be for the election of more African American candidates. Because the analysis in this chapter is based on data from 2004 and earlier, this research needs to be extended to include more recent elections.

Although descriptive representation is the primary focus of the research, Chapters 5 and 6 address Latino substantive representation. Casellas conducted 23 in-depth interviews, from 2005 to 2007, at annual meetings of the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials and the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators. These interviews provide insights into the way that Latino legislators view themselves. The concomitant analysis provides a nice example of how to integrate qualitative and quantitative analysis in order to provide information about Latino identities and interests. The policy areas most important to Latino legislators are the economy/budget, public safety, health, and education. Even though the legislators come from very different districts, often reflective of important subethnic differences, Casellas finds that there are common bonds that transcend party, class, and region, such as language policy and education. Furthermore, the initial involvement in politics for most Latino legislators was through the labor movement, by volunteering for other candidates, or because of personal/issue reasons.

Generalizations like these help to address the issue of what constitutes a Latino interest, a persistent challenge that confronts researchers. Like most, Casellas argues that Latinos are neither politically monolithic nor as strongly partisan as African Americans (p. 127). There are different ways to frame the concept of Latino interests, two of which are prominent: Is there a common core of issue positions

shared by all or an overwhelming majority of Latinos; and what are the differences among the interests of Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban Americans? The simultaneous pursuit of these two questions is a difficult challenge.

The author argues that little research has been done on state-level Latino substantive representation and that research on Latino substantive representation in Congress has overemphasized roll-call voting. No longer in the nascent stages, the literature on congressional substantive representation of Latinos, whether based on roll-call voting data or other data, is inchoate and in need of development that converges more clearly on the concept of substantive representation. Hanna Pitkin's classic work of analytic philosophy has for decades served as the standard for empirical researchers wishing to evaluate and measure substantive representation. Casellas, however, argues that Pitkin's concept of substantive representation is an inadequate, outdated guide for empirical studies of *racial representation*, a concept he introduces but never clearly defines, nor adequately compares to substantive representation. The theoretical development of the notion of racial representation is thin and in need of explication. Moreover, racial representation is discussed not by reference to its key characteristics but primarily by what its correlates are.

Previous research on the representation of Latinos using congressional roll-call votes has employed Conservative Coalition scores (CC), Southwest Voter Research Institute scores (SWVRI), National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA) scores, and Poole-Rosenthal NOMINATE scores. Roll-call voting analysis that employs NOMINATE scores, as Casellas does, shifts the analytic focus from Latino interests/substantive representation to legislator ideology. The research question becomes "What are the determinants of legislator ideology?" It is no longer "What are the determinants of legislative voting for Latino interests?" The gulf between these two questions may be substantial. The optimal design for the investigation of substantive representation should include, as the dependent variable, votes that are consistent with Latino interests or clearly inconsistent (e.g., SWVRI and NHLA scores) or votes that are consistent with the interests of selected subethnic groups.

Casellas' findings are mixed, but in most instances (i.e., the 87th through 104th Congresses and the legislatures of Texas, Colorado, and New Jersey), the Latino representative variable is unrelated to legislator ideology. Percentage of Latino-district population is unrelated to legislator ideology in Congress and in Colorado, but in the Texas and New Jersey lower chambers, higher percentages of Latinos are associated with more liberal member ideologies. Another weakness of the roll-call analysis is that the author does not report multicollinearity diagnostics, yet many of these variables are well known for multicollinearity problems.

In light of the preponderance of null findings, the consequences of variance inflation deserve consideration.

In sum, Casellas' research constitutes a significant intellectual contribution to the literature on Latino representation. The issues of substantive representation, currency, and possible multicollinearity do not seriously detract from the overall quality of the book, a book that is sure to stimulate additional research on Latino descriptive representation and to contribute to ongoing controversies in the demanding, provocative area of Latino substantive representation.

Arms and the University: Military Presence and the Civic Education of Non-Military Students. By Donald Alexander Downs and Ilia Murtazashvili. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 456p. \$34.99.
doi:10.1017/S153759271200374X

— Michael W. Mosser, *University of Texas at Austin*

What does a military presence bring to the American academy? Does the military even belong on college campuses? And what exactly is the state of security studies in American higher education? In their book, Donald Downs and Ilia Murtazashvili take a threefold approach to answering these questions, and in so doing have produced a work of uncommon breadth and scope that will appeal to audiences in both camps.

Divided into a pedagogical survey of military education within the university, a "field guide" to security studies programs at major American universities, and a detailed account of the complex and evolving relationship between Columbia University and its Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program, *Arms and the University* reads very much like three separate (and not entirely equal) works. This unusual organizational scheme presents challenges and opportunities both for the reader and for the reviewer. In the end, however, the book succeeds reasonably well at weaving its disparate strands into a coherent whole. It does so by remaining true to its focus on its core question (p. 5): "What is the appropriate role or presence for the military and military-related studies in American higher education?"

The majority of the book is concerned with answering this question via an examination of the evolution of the ROTC program at Ivy League campuses, looking specifically at Columbia University's relationship with it. The story of the decreasing antipathy of at least some parts of the academy, primarily the Ivy League, toward the military (that is, the ROTC program) was still unfolding as the book was going to press. Naturally, a compelling narrative such as this comprises a large part of Downs and Murtazashvili's comprehensive examination of the relationship between the military and the university in contemporary America. But it is not the only narrative told in the book. The other sections include a theoretical over-

view detailing the authors' intellectual framework and driving questions, as well as a thorough survey of security studies programs at major universities across the country. But it is the ROTC/Ivy League story that occupies center stage.

Since the end of the Vietnam War, the association between the academy and the military has been at best a reluctant partnership. The passage of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" (DADT) legislation in 1993, which barred openly gay service members from serving, only deepened the rift. The passage of the Solomon Amendment in 1996, which gave the Secretary of Defense the ability to withhold funds from universities that prohibited ROTC recruitment on their campuses and was upheld in an appeal to the US Supreme Court in 2006, added to the tension. It gave a specific twist to the general question asked previously: Should universities allow the military a presence on campus when at least some of its regulations run expressly counter to the stated intent of university charters and mission statements?

In the 1990s and 2000s, that problem was far from an academic exercise. Indeed, scholars of this specific issue considered it to be of paramount importance in untangling at least two strands in the complex web of state/society interactions in contemporary American society (e.g., see Clay Calvert and Robert D. Richards, "Challenging the Wisdom of Solomon: The First Amendment and Military Recruitment on Campus," *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 13 [2004–5]: 205–44; and Geoffrey M. Wyatt, "The Third Amendment in the Twenty-First Century: Military Recruiting on Private Campuses," *New England Law Review* 40 [2005]: 113). Many scholars saw DADT as only the most public evidence of the growing "gap" between the academy and the military, and indeed between the military and society as a whole (e.g., see Gary Schmidt and Cheryl Miller, "The Military Should Mirror the Nation: America's Armed Forces Are Drawn from an Increasingly Narrow Segment of American Society," *Wall Street Journal*, 26 August 2010; and Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*, 2001).

Yet in 2011, only a few short months after the repeal of the DADT legislation, Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale Universities readmitted ROTC to their campuses, implying that the disconnect between the university and the military (at least in the case of these Ivy League schools) was not so much a fundamental question of identity as it was a fairly straightforward anti-discrimination stance that was easily reversed once the offending piece of legislation was repealed. Downs and Murtazashvili strongly agree with this sentiment and indeed argue that the military as a whole (and not just ROTC) deserves to have a *greater* role in both the academy and in the public's perception (pp. 28–34, 411–20).